

Date: Wed, 20 Jul 94 04:30:22 PDT
From: Ham-Policy Mailing List and Newsgroup <ham-policy@ucsd.edu>
Errors-To: Ham-Policy-Errors@UCSD.Edu
Reply-To: Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu
Precedence: Bulk
Subject: Ham-Policy Digest V94 #318
To: Ham-Policy

Ham-Policy Digest Wed, 20 Jul 94 Volume 94 : Issue 318

Today's Topics:

 After 93 days, the wait is over! (2 msgs)
 Combine the tests proposal
 CW ... My view.
 Re: Does CW as a pre-req REALLY Work?
 reply
 The Universal CW Thread

Send Replies or notes for publication to: <Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu>
Send subscription requests to: <Ham-Policy-REQUEST@UCSD.Edu>
Problems you can't solve otherwise to brian@ucsd.edu.

Archives of past issues of the Ham-Policy Digest are available
(by FTP only) from UCSD.Edu in directory "mailarchives/ham-policy".

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text
herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official
policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.

Date: Tue, 19 Jul 1994 15:30:31 GMT
From: netcomsv!butch!NewsWatcher!user@decwrl.dec.com
Subject: After 93 days, the wait is over!
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

After 93 days waiting, I finally got my Tech No Code license. The exam was
passed on April 16 and the issue licensed on July 14, although I did not
receive it until July 18. Call sign is KE6ISD.

If you are going to call the FCC in Gettysburg to ask about your license,
my advice is "save your money." I was informed that they "do not log in"
applications. They can only tell you that an license as issued on some date
and subsequently mailed on another date.

IMHO, 90+ days is absurd. I am going to write my US Representative,
Senators and the VP suggesting that they consider privitizing the amateur
license "issuing operation." Surely a better job could be done by a private

corporation. Personally, I would have been willing to pay \$25-\$50, if I meant I could get my license in 5 business days or less.

Date: 19 Jul 1994 15:50:43 -0700
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!news.cerf.net!ccnet.com!ccnet.com!not-for-mail@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: After 93 days, the wait is over!
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

David L. Sampson (DAVID_SAMPSON@QM.IS.LMSC.LOCKHEED.COM) wrote:

: IMHO, 90+ days is absurd. I am going to write my US Representative,
: Senators and the VP suggesting that they consider privatizing the amateur
: license "issuing operation." Surely a better job could be done by a private
: corporation. Personally, I would have been willing to pay \$25-\$50, if I
: meant I could get my license in 5 business days or less.

You may want to do some research of other radio services that have privatized their licencing bureaus. A simple business radio service licence takes over thirty days and costs over two hundred fifty dollars.

Instant gratification does have its costs. Why not ask your congressmen to fund a couple more fcc data entry clerks so the existing process would work. The privatized licencing bureaus have electronic filing with the fcc, why not work to get the amateur VECs on line as well. The VECs have done the hard work, there is no reason to pay \$25-\$50 for less than a minutes typing.

Bob

--

Bob Wilkins	work	bwilkins@cave.org
Berkeley, California	home	rwilkins@ccnet.com
94701-0710	play	n6fri@n6eeg.#nocal.ca.usa.noam

Date: Tue, 19 Jul 1994 06:40:00 EST
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!dog.ee.lbl.gov!agate!usenet.ins.cwru.edu!wariat.org!amcomp!dan@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: Combine the tests proposal
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

whs70@dancer.cc.bellcore.com (sohl,william h) writes:

>I've floated this idea before, but it usually gets lost in the
>debate. The pro-CW folks, in my not so humble opinion, have never
>seriously offered any discussion or debate against the proposal.
>I think they just hope it dies on the vine. Frankly, I don't see
>a lot of NO CW proponents in this newsgroup overall. Sure there are
>a few, but most folks seem to be for lowering the CW requirements or in
>some other way deemphasizing the PASS/FAIL roadblock of the CW elements.
>
>Every time this idea is voiced it seems to quickly die with the
>ongoing debate shifted back to the: Why is CW important vs
>everyone else. Frankly, most of us are not at all saying
>we should eliminate all CW testing or CW use, rather we just
>want to see CW get no more emphasis than any other mode with
>the one caveat being that we should retain the minimum CW testing
>level to stay compliant with international treaties.

Not that this is absolutely necessary, but....

[snip]

>I plan to formalise my "proposal" (if I ever have enough spare time :-)
>in a letter to ARRL first. Let's stay in contact.

Is there any interest in an email list to organize this? I can probably
find a host.

Dan N8PKV

--

"Is life so dear, or peace so sweet, as to be purchased at the price
of chains and slavery? Forbid it, Almighty God! I know not what
course others may take, but as for me, GIVE ME LIBERTY, OR GIVE ME
DEATH!" -Patrick Henry, Virginia House of Burgesses on March 23,1775
=+=+=> Ted Kennedy's car has killed more people than my gun! - Me

Date: 19 Jul 1994 12:51:41 GMT
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!agate!howland.reston.ans.net!europa.eng.gtefsd.com!
newsxfer.itd.umich.edu!newsrelay.iastate.edu!news.iastate.edu!isuvax.iastate.edu!
TWP77@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: CW ... My view.
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <408@ted.win.net>, mjsilva@ted.win.net (Michael Silva) writes:
>More to the point, why do you insist on assigning to me a view exactly
>opposite what I just stated in the lines above?

I said you say you don't care what they build, and also you want it to be easy

to construct and rewarding at the same time. How is this different than what you said? I see no difference, just that I don't see your criteria making QRP rigs the best choice for everyone.

Date: Tue, 19 Jul 1994 14:15:03 GMT
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!usc!howland.reston.ans.net!cs.utexas.edu!wotan.compaq.com!
twisto.eng.hou.compaq.com!news@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: Re: Does CW as a pre-req REALLY Work?
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

>In article <30caal\$8cl@apple.com> kchen@apple.com (Kok Chen) writes:

>

>>Re: the "major portion" part of your statement, take a read of
>>KK6EK's Peter I Island book when you have the chance. 3Y0PI's
>>QSO ratio was 5:3 in favour of phone.

>

>>Surely, CW being a major portion of ham activity, and added to
>>that the fact that it is purported to be more efficient, the QSO
>>ratio should have been skewed way over on the other side?

>

>>73

>

>Hmm... Lets see. It takes two to make a QSO. Maybe this incident says
>something about the CW handling proficiency of the 3Y0PI operators.
>Maybe they had fallen for this "hey I've got voice and I've got packet, I
>want to use them on everywhere on HF but not learn the code" philosophy and
>lost their CW proficiency. Come to think of it their ops did sound a little
>tattered.

>

>Lets face it. The "Big Kahuna" has you beat on the 50% CW argument. I
>repeated Jeffrey's exeriment here high atop blueberry hill, surveyed
>all bands in all countries, and he is right.

>

If memory serves me right they were looking for seasoned cw ops prior to the expedition. Always seems to be a shortage of really good cw pileup ops.

If you think you'd be hot stuff in a pileup, Get a hold of the PED pileup generator for soundblaster. It generates an 18 station CW pileup with QRM. A most humbling experience when turned on in the chaos mode.

Earl Morse
KZ8E

KZ8E@bangate.compaq.com

Date: Tue, 19 Jul 1994 06:33:00 EST
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!agate!usenet.ins.cwru.edu!wariat.org!amcomp!
dan@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: reply
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

mack@mails.imed.COM (Mack Ray) writes:

>One last item:
>
>I only see about 10 people or so active here. Are there more out
>there just listening?

Just like on local repeaters, lots of people listen, a few LOUD MOUTHS
take up the bandwidth. :-)

Dan

--
"Is life so dear, or peace so sweet, as to be purchased at the price
of chains and slavery? Forbid it, Almighty God! I know not what
course others may take, but as for me, GIVE ME LIBERTY, OR GIVE ME
DEATH!" -Patrick Henry, Virginia House of Burgesses on March 23, 1775
==> Ted Kennedy's car has killed more people than my gun! - Me

Date: 19 Jul 94 12:26:40 -0500
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!agate!howland.reston.ans.net!europa.eng.gtefsd.com!ulowell!
woods.uml.edu!martinja@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: The Universal CW Thread
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <774570428.42snx@n2ayj.overleaf.com>, n2ayj@n2ayj.overleaf.com
(Stan Olochwoszcz N2AYJ) writes:

> What d'ya think, sirs?

Don't call me sir.....I got out of the military last year....was an enlisted
man and WORKED for a living....now I do cw as a hobby....those who don't work
for a living are the only ones entitled to be called "sir."

Hehehe hehe hehehe..... &|D

73 de WK1V

-jim-

Date: Tue, 19 Jul 1994 07:21:59 GMT
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!usc!nic-nac.CSU.net!charnel.ecst.csuchico.edu!csusac!
csus.edu!netcom.com!carreiro@network.ucsd.edu
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <9406157743.AA774303460@mails.imed.com>,
<306t78\$i9j@agate.berkeley.edu>, <307oau\$ej0@dancer.cc.bellcore.com>rre
Subject : Re: Thoughts on CW testing

: Please suggest how YOU would improve the testing over what is done
: today.
: Bill Sohl (K2UNK) BELLCORE (Bell Communications Research, Inc.)

Well Bill, since you asked...

If I had a magic wand that I could waive over the FCC, I would institute limited license terms on all Amateur Radio classes renewable only upon passage of a comprehensive test showing that the licensee is worthy of holding that level of license. You don't pass, you slip down a level and privileges are taken away until you can again show that you have attained the level of competence required for a higher license. If you're at the bottom of the license structure, and you don't pass the re-test, your license is revoked until you again can show your competence level is at the correct level. That would be my one dying wish in this world.

In my opinion, the competence level of incoming Amateurs has been dropping off over the past 10 years. Yes, we're breeding appliance operators these days. The current test program almost promotes such operators. So too do the manufacturers, but you can hardly blame them. After all, business is business. All we can hope for is a change to the current testing program. Realistic, up-to-date and comprehensive tests WITHOUT actual question pools available is what I pray for.

What I have stated is not a proposal, for I am realistic in what changes can be brought forth in today's "get as many new hams as possible" and "why should I have to learn that stuff if I'm not going to use it?" atmosphere. It is simply my wish, and I am absolutely convinced that Amateur Radio would be a better service in the long run if that wish were granted. Also, I have purposefully left out specific details as to what would constitute a competency level. Squabbling about that level of detail is useless, futile and I will not respond to such arguments.

I welcome all constructive comments, pro or con.
73 till next time.
Paul N6HCS
carreiro@netcom.com
N6HCS @ N0ARY.#NOCAL.CA.USA.NOAM

--

carreiro@netcom.com
N6HCS@N0ARY.#NOCAL.CA.USA.NA

Date: Tue, 19 Jul 1994 06:14:00 EST
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!dog.ee.lbl.gov!agate!usenet.ins.cwru.edu!wariat.org!amcomp!
dan@network.ucsd.edu
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <CsyEz4.2MK@news.Hawaii.Edu>, <1994Jul18.135928.10634@ke4zv.atl.ga.us>,
<Ct5wrJ.830@news.Hawaii.Edu>
Subject : Re: Re: Does CW as a pre-req REALLY Work?

jeffrey@kahuna.tmc.edu (Jeffrey Herman) writes:

>In article <1994Jul18.135928.10634@ke4zv.atl.ga.us> gary@ke4zv.atl.ga.us (Gary
Coffman) writes:
>>In article <CsyEz4.2MK@news.Hawaii.Edu> jeffrey@kahuna.tmc.edu (Jeffrey Herman)
writes:
>>>
>>>2. Example: The Northern California QRP Club, NorCal, produced a
>>>40M CW-only transceiver kit (\$70); at least 300 units were
>>>produced - supplies were depleted within a short time.
>>
>>Gee, a whole 300 units. GRAPES has shipped an order of magnitude
>>more 56 kb RF modem kits than that, and that's a highly specialized
>>unit.
>
>Ouch! Something important seems to have been cut from my statement
>above: ``I could give more examples...'' or something like that.
>If I listed them all the article would have been too long. Want
>to guess how many clubs around the nation have produced kits?
>
>Watch that editing, my friend.

Jeff,

We are friends, at least in MY opinion and I hope yours too. However, the
simple fact that you find only 50% of CW in an area where CW is REQUIRED
to gain access is SIGNIFIGANT! If you enjoy it, GREAT! I am very happy

that you find an aspect of amateur radio that you enjoy so much. The purpose of the discussion is not "is CW used in amateur radio" the answer to that is obvious. The question I ask is, what purpose of the ARS does continued pass/fail testing achieve?

I ask you this friend to friend (Yes, I DO consider Jeff a friend and if you have a problem with that, tough shit). Lets BOTH try and address this with out emotion. As an intelectual discussion. If you would...

73 My Friend,

Dan

--

"Is life so dear, or peace so sweet, as to be purchased at the price of chains and slavery? Forbid it, Almighty God! I know not what course others may take, but as for me, GIVE ME LIBERTY, OR GIVE ME DEATH!" -Patrick Henry, Virginia House of Burgesses on March 23,1775
==> Ted Kennedy's car has killed more people than my gun! - Me

Date: 19 Jul 1994 15:21:05 -0700

From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!news.cerf.net!ccnet.com!ccnet.com!not-for-mail@network.ucsd.edu

To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <CssMMB.1Gp@wang.com>, <bmicales.140.2E2B2B89@facstaff.wisc.edu>, <Ct6C8n.CoJ@news.Hawaii.Edu>

Subject : Re: Emergency TX on police freq.

Jeffrey Herman (jeffrey@kahuna.tmc.edu) wrote:

: Here's an idea: If your HT will transmit and receive on 156.80 MHz
: and if you live near the coast or a large lake, then in life/death
: situations you'll be able to call for and receive help on that
: frequency. It is the international distress and calling channel

: Note that the Coast Guard's remote bases are located atop
: choice mountaintops along the coast and coverage is continuous
: along the coasts and offshore to 50-100 miles; no claims are
: made as to their inland coverage, though.

The Coast Guard as well as 12 amateur repeaters transmit from Mt Diablo, there are 6 amateur repeaters on Mt Tamalpius as well as 7 amateur repeaters on Mt Umunhum. These three choice mountain tops are the Group San Francisco and Group Monterey Coast Guard radio sites. I find it vary difficult to beleive that one has to leave the amateur bands to make an emergency call.

The fellow who gave up his radio in san diego must have lost his head in the emergency. Every one knows that there is at least one amateur repeater at county sheriffs radio sites for the local races or ares groups. We all know that the local amateur radio repeaters are far better than most sheriffs radio systems ... why do you think they are going to 800 MHz trunked systems?

The other night I was able to chat with the folks on the Hawaii state races 2meter network. Fabulous conditions allowed me to use just five watts while driving through the Berkeley Hills.

Where were you Jeff? Monitoring channel 16?

Why use the amateur radio service when you could program:

emergency rations	mc donalds
emergency tow	aaa
emergency ambulance	hospital net
emergency housing	hilton
emergency airlift	united
emergency plumbing	roto-rooter

Your idea is a good one Jeff. All the local loons will lose their amateur privilidges by using other radio services for their personal emergencies.

emergency mental psyco ward

;0 some one else must have posted this ;) ;) ;)

Bob

--			
	Bob Wilkins	work	bwilkins@cave.org
	Berkeley, California	home	rwilkins@ccnet.com
	94701-0710	play	n6fri@n6eeg.#nocal.ca.usa.noam

Date: 19 Jul 94 12:37:04 -0500
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!library.ucla.edu!europa.eng.gtefsd.com!ulowell!woods.uml.edu!
martinja@network.ucsd.edu
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <1994Jul15.205054.1463@mixcom.mixcom.com> ,

<3074ud\$c2h@news.u.washington.edu>, <30g0ek\$cvu@grex.cyberspace.org>
Subject : Re: 11 meters taking it back!!

What?!? Take 11 meters back?

Ha! Hahahahahaha! Hahahaha! Hahahahahahahaha! Hehehehehehehehehehehehehehe!

FORGET IT! Will never happen except in your wildest dreams!

-jim- WK1V said that...

Date: 19 Jul 1994 22:35:33 GMT
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!swrinde!emory!europa.eng.gtefsd.com!newsxfer.itd.umich.edu!
jobone!news1.oakland.edu!condor.ic.net!grex.cyberspace.org!mcs@network.ucsd.edu
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <2vsae6\$fsv@chnews.intel.com>,
<071294174505Rnf0.78@amcomp.com>,<\$P\$8kiubGMn0066yn@access.digex.net>,
<301dg0\$gbg@news.iastate.edu>
Subject : Re: Does CW as a pre-req REALLY Work?

One of the reasons why they require a knowledge for CW is to:

- a) Preserve the original mode of communication for DX Amateur Radio
- b) Provide for an international way of communicating

I know alot of lids, kids, space cadets, radio shack ht users, rubber duck
proponents, and cb lingo differendos who just sit on the 2-meter band and
yack away, and I think that's fine...but you should also get into HF
operation and do AT LEAST a little CW. I know one person who took the 5
WPM test just to have it, and he HATES CW. Go figure.

73 de -.- ---.. -.-. -.-. (KB8RBF/5)

End of Ham-Policy Digest V94 #318
